LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Alignment of the Angamali-Parur Road.

193. MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI: (*a*) Will the Government be pleased to state whether the newly sanctioned bridge on the road from Angamali to Parur is to be so constructed as to lead to a new road to Mallusseri Kara instead of to the shorter road already existing?

(*b*) Are the Government aware that this will necessitate nearly two miles of additional road construction besides increased cost on account of land acquisition charges and the abandonment of the existing shorter road to Parur?

(*c*) Will the Government be pleased to ask the Chief Engineer to make a personal inspection of the locality before the construction of the bridge is proceeded with?

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI: (*a*) The sanctioned arrangement has not been deviated from. The bridge sanctioned is not solely for the Angamali-Parur road, but also for the equally important Elavur road, both of which have a common crossing at the Kotakulangara river. The embankment sanctioned beyond the bridge is on the Elavur route and an investigation is being made to connect it with the Parur route.

(*b*) No. When the connection referred to above is also opened, the route to Parur will be longer only by about 100 yards than the existing low level route. Only a short bit of the existing road will have to be abandoned, being too low and costly to raise.

(*c*) It is not possible to alter the sanctioned site for the bridge, the lands on either side having been already acquired. Government do not consider it necessary to suspend the work until the Chief Engineer inspects the locality.

MR. N. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI: In the answer to part (*a*), it is stated that "the bridge sanctioned is not solely for the Angamali-Parur road, but also for the equally important Elavur road." May I know whether the road sanctioned is the road leading from Angamali to Parur?

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI: I claim notice.

Erection of New Places of Public Worship.

194. MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: (*a*) Are the Government aware of the difficulties and expenses the people have to undergo in the matter of getting sanction for building new places of public worship?

(*b*) Will the Government be pleased to state whether they have any objection to reduce the distance referred to in column 5 in the form of application appended to the Proclamation dated the 13th Vrischikam, 1074, to a furlong or two?

(*c*) Will the Government be pleased to furnish a statement showing:

(i) the number of applications for the erection of new places of public worship received during the years 1095, 1096 and 1097, respectively;

[Mr. R. Krishna Pillai]

(ii) the number of applications made by caste Hindus, non-caste Hindus, Mahomedans and Christians respectively, during these three years;

(iii) the number of applications granted by the Government to the applicants of the respective communities; and

(iv) the reasons for refusal?

(*d*) Will the Government be pleased to state what their object is in having introduced the recent rule that all applications for the erection of new places of public worship should be referred to the Devaswom Commissioner?

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI: (*a*) No.

(*b*) The Government do not consider it expedient to interfere with the existing provisions of the Proclamation.

(*c*) A statement* giving the information required by the member is laid on the table.

(*d*) The Devaswom Commissioner is the adviser to Government in matters relating to Devaswom Administration and as such his opinion in regard to applications for permission to open places of public worship with reference to existing Devaswoms has to be considered.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: With regard to answer to part (*b*), will the Government be pleased to give any reason for considering it not expedient?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: It is not in the nature of a supplementary question.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: In the answer it is stated that "Government do not consider it expedient." I want to know whether the Government can give me any reason.

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI: The answer given there distinctly shows the reason. The reason is expediency.

MR. J JOHN NIDIRY: On what is it based?

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI: I claim notice.

Applications for the Erection of Christian Churches.

195. MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN: Will the Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many applications were made to the Government within the last ten years for putting up Christian churches?

(*b*) how many of these applications were granted, and how many refused and on what grounds?

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI: (*a*) & (*b*) A statement† furnishing the information, as far as available, is laid on the table.

Vide Appendix III—page 674.

† *Vide* Appendix IV—page 675.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Appendix III.

Statement of applications for the erection of places of public worship during 1095, 1096, and 1097.

[*Vide* **Answer to Question No. 194.**]

Year	Total number of applications.	No. sanctioned.	No. rejected.	Reasons for refusal.
CASTE HINDUS.				
1095	1	1	...	
1096	1	1	...	
1097	2	1	1	The applicant had no proprietary right over the site.
MAHOMEDANS.				
1095	4	4	...	
1096	11	4	7	The site was in objectionable proximity to other places of public worship (2 cases). The applicant had no proprietary right over the site (1 case). Rejected on technical grounds (3 cases). Rejected in the interests of public health (1 case).
1097	13	6	7	Application withdrawn (1 case). Rejected on technical grounds 3 cases). The site was in objectionable proximity to other places of public worship (3 cases).
CHRISTIANS.				
1095	31	22	9	The Applicant had no proprietary right over the site (4 cases). The site was in objectionable proximity to other places of public worship (5 cases).
1096	64	36	28	The applicant had no proprietary right over the site (11 cases). Wrong description of the site (3 cases). Rejected on technical grounds (6 cases) The site was in objectionable proximity to other places of public worship (7 cases). Application was not made on behalf of any congregation, as stated by the applicant (1 case).
1097	48	23	25	Rejected on technical grounds (4 cases). Application withdrawn (2 cases). Wrong description of the site (1 case). The applicant had no proprietary right over the site (11 cases). The site was in objectionable proximity to other places of public worship (7 cases).

No applications were made by non-caste Hindus

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly